COMMENTS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on 7/24/2008. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-46 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicant has: 1) amended claims 1, 11, 19, 29, 36 and 37; 2) not canceled any claims; and. 3) not added any claims. As such, claims 1-46 remain pending. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims 1-46.

The Examiner has again maintained that independent claims 1, 19 and 37 are anticipated by Boykin. The Applicant's claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

> receiving from a classfile registration information comprising a class name **and different method names** for more than one of said class's methods, wherein said class name is in the form of a character string and where each of said method names are in the form of a character string and wherein each of said methods **have been previously modified** with at least one additional byte code instruction to cause, for its respective method, a plug-in module's handler method to provide output function treatment for said respective method;

> referring to a plug-in pattern to determine which of a plurality of plug-in modules are appropriate for each of said methods, said plug-in pattern listing for each of said plug-in modules those of said methods that are to be handled with its corresponding output function treatment; and,

> updating a dictionary to include information from said plug-in pattern; and,

basing a new numeric name for said class upon the order in which said classfile has registered with respect to the registration of other classfiles and passing said new numeric name to said classfile.

In an interview held with the Examiner on September 5, 2008, the Applicant outlined to the Examiner the deficiencies of the Boykin reference.

In particular, with respect to the first two items of the emphasized claim language above, the Applicant explained that Boykin only describes the passing of a classfile name from a classfile - and not the passing of a classfile name and method names. Moreover, the Applicant pointed out to the Examiner that Boykin does not disclose the passing of a classfile name whose corresponding methods have been previously modified. Specifically, the Applicant pointed out to the Examiner that the "injector" of Boykin, in response to its receipt of a classfile name, modifies or "injects" bytecode into the classfile's methods. Thus, the Applicant identified two specific distinctions between the teachings of Boykin and the claimed subject matter so as to make clear that Boykin does not anticipate the Applicant's claims. These same differences have already been explained at length in the Applicant's previous office action responses to which the Examiner is again referred.

Nevertheless, in the interests of moving the present application toward allowance, the Applicant has added additional limitations to the claimed subject matter. These new limitations (the newly added "updating" and "basing" limitations) are supported at least by Fig. 18 and corresponding discussion of the Applicant's specification which shows additional processes performed by the dispatcher in

response to its receipt of classname and method name information from a modified classfile.

A first of this processes updates a dictionary with the plug-in pattern information. As described in the Applicant's specification, the plug-in patter is essentially derived from user input describing the desired testing procedures to be performed for the classfile's methods. The dictionary is the actual data structure that the dispatcher refers to during runtime when the modified methods are executed. The passed numeric identifier can be used by the modified method to identify itself to the dispatcher during runtime (e.g., and used by the dispatcher as a lookup parameter into the dictionary). The Applicant has also amended the independent claims to recite that the classfile names and method names are presented as character strings so as to contrast against the numeric identifier.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims of the present application are therefore allowable of the Boykin reference and respectfully requests the allowance of the same.

In the further interests of efficiency, the Applicant reserves the right under MPEP 2144.03.C to cause the Examiner to find in the prior art subject matter to which the Examiner has taken Official Notice at a later time in the prosecution of the present case when the subject matter of such prior art is actually at issue.

REMARKS

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No.

02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of this

application, the Examiner is invited to contact Robert B. O'Rourke at

(408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: /9-24-2008/   /Robert B. O'Rourke/
                            Robert B. O'Rourke
                            Reg. No. 46,972

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300